

THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

FOREIGN IMMIGRATION, DEATH TO SLAVERY.

We extract the following suggestive paragraphs from the Raleigh Register, accompanied by the comments thereon of the Lynchburg Virginian:

"In the year 1790, and for several years thereafter, the South had forty-seven members of the House of Representatives while the North had only thirty-four. Since that time the North has by means of foreign accession, been steadily increasing its representation, and left the South in a minority of more than half a hundred; and this huge majority will increase continually, and we will become weaker and weaker, year after year, unless we do something for our safety. Let the fifteen States that can be made of Nebraska, and the twelve of Kansas and the number that can be made of Utah, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, &c., apply for admission into the Union as States, which they will soon do, unless a stop is put to this immense importation of foreigners, and see in what a beautiful minority we will be. Then ought not the South to do its best to remedy this great and growing evil? Certainly, and the only way is to vote for Millard Fillmore, who will carry out American principles, and, in some degree, put a stop to immigration."

"We take the foregoing from the Raleigh Register. A man need only refer to the Census tables to satisfy himself of its truth. But for immigration, the Southern States would not only have maintained the preponderance in the North, but held in 1790, but would have added to it, for those tables show that in native increase of population the South has exceeded the North."

"Should Mr. Buchanan be elected President, it will be regarded abroad as a declaration against the Native American policy, and an invitation to foreigners to come and settle in the United States. Our Government, an invitation of which will not be slow to avail themselves. As a matter of choice and of principle, they will settle nine to one, in the free States and Territories. The immense regions lying west of the North Atlantic are long divided into States, and seek admission into the Union. Immigration and Squatter Sovereignty will have made them free States. Where will the South be, when they are thrown into the scale against her? Texas will add four or five States will furnish no counterpoise. Cuba would add but another State. Should we acquire the whole of Mexico, we have the highest Democratic authority for believing that Squatter Sovereignty would make it all free. Where is the South to find relief and protection? Nowhere, but in battling at the threshold and to the heart of those powerful Democratic agents of Free Soil—Immigration and Squatter Sovereignty. Unless they can be stifled and subdued, the South is lost, remedilessly and forever. Unless we conquer them, they will conquer us. Shall we not make united and manly effort now?"

No man can reflect upon the subject thus discussed, without being fully and completely convinced that the radical modification, if not the absolute and unconditional repeal, of the naturalization laws, is demanded by the highest interests of the South. Strange indeed that those men should wilfully shut their eyes to the patent and pressing fact that the Southern section of the Union is fast becoming a leeward of wind and a draught of water for the North, in consequence of the immense and constant influx of immigration, which annually flows to our shores from the effect and Anti-Republican Governments of the old world. It is a well-known and undisputed fact, that ninety-nine out of every hundred emigrants from Europe take up their residence in the Northern States, become permanent citizens, and add immeasurably to the political power of that portion of the Union. Scarcely a single State in the great Northwest, but has been settled and built up almost exclusively by emigrants from abroad. For several consecutive years, the number of foreigners annually reaching this country amounted to five hundred thousand—which is equivalent to an addition of five members of Congress per year to the North, and an addition of fifty members in the short space of ten years. So long as the North continues to be flooded with this rate with a foreign population, how is it to be expected that the South can compete with the North in the race for political power? As remarked in one of the quotations above, "but for immigration, the Southern States would not only have maintained the preponderance in the Union they held in 1790, but would have added to it; for the census tables show that in native increase of population the South has exceeded the North."

From being far in advance of the North in political weight and importance, we have, by means of immigration alone, dwindled down and down until we are now completely at the mercy of our Northern enemies. And yet men here at the South pretending to love of the South and pretending to sagacity and statesmanship, resist any and all attempts to remedy the vast and growing evil, which is daily sheathing us of our strength, and eating into our very vitals.

FRANCES E. WATKINS.

This remarkable woman delivered a lecture on the condition of the African race in our country, in the Old Fells Hall, on Tuesday evening. We have styled her a remarkable woman, as for beauty of language, distinctness of enunciation, and clearness of argument, no one is excelled by any female, or perhaps any male, that has appeared in our city in the character of lecturer for many years. She commenced her address by an allusion to the different nations of the earth, their rise, progress, and decay; the birth, growth, power, and capacity and the death of men and Statesmen. She observed our country had suddenly become great, powerful and opulent, its press was free, thought uncensored, there were no stately palaces or courtly thrones to oppress industry, and the future appeared bright; yet she likened it to a beautiful woman who without was passing fat, while a cancer was eating into her heart, absorbing her strength, and infusing those who envied them. She spoke over an hour, and on concluding at the desire of the persons present, consented to deliver an after lecture on last evening—*Dulcinea, Republican.*

STATE TRIALS IN KANSAS.

The State trials in Kansas seem to be drawing to a close. Of the parties indicted, more than a hundred in number, much the larger part were known as Harvey's men. The circumstances under which they were arrested, were as follows:—On the 11th of September, Mr. Geary assumed office, and issued a proclamation revoking all the militia orders of his predecessor, Acting Governor Woodson, and commanding all bodies of men in arms without authority, forthwith to disperse or to leave the Territory. The Missouri army, which, under the lead of Atchison, had invaded the Territory and destroyed Oswatimie, finding themselves in great disorder and badly organized, had, prior to this, retreated out of the Territory and disbanded for the moment, but with the understanding that they would reassemble on the 15th and then march on to Lawrence, and destroy it. As a forerunner of this invasion, a body of Ruffians had appeared in the neighborhood of Grass-hopper Falls, had plundered the town, and had afterwards established themselves at Hickory Point. Prior to the issue of Geary's proclamation, Lane had marched from Lawrence with a body of men

against these marauders; but after some skirmishing, finding the enemy posted, he had sent back for reinforcements and a piece of cannon. Soon after, however, Governor Geary's proclamation came to his hands, when he read it to his men, disbanded them and announced his intention to retire temporarily from the Territory. Harvey with his men and machine guns, met Lane, with the cannon, and not finding Lane determined to make the attack themselves. After some fighting, in which one of the Ruffians was killed and several wounded, a truce was agreed to, those who held the post, most of whom were Missourians, stipulating to retire from the Territory. As Harvey's men were returning to Lawrence in different parties most of them were taken prisoners by the United States dragoons, though Harvey himself was not of the number.

That very same day, the assembled army of Missourians, led now by a Colonel of General Reid had approached within a few miles of Lawrence, which, in consequence of the Governor's proclamation, was in an adequate state of defense. The army, however, interposed with its dragoons, and finally persuaded Reid to retire. Harvey's men, though they were residents in the Territory employed in driving out invaders from abroad, were treated as criminals, arrested, examined before Judge Cato, and committed to prison on a charge of murder, till being refused Reid's men, though they were Missourians, and their leader himself a member elect of the Missouri Legislature, and though they had assembled in arms and marched on Lawrence in defiance of Geary's proclamation, were treated at the time, and are spoken of in Geary's dispatches, as Kansas militia lawfully in arms under Woodson's proclamation. Intrusive voting and a bogus Legislature are not enough—Kansas must have also a bogus militia; and undoubtedly it was just as competent for Missouri to do so, as for Kansas to do so. It was as that of Kansas voters and legislators. It was as those invaders, thus recognized by Geary as Kansas militia, were, under his orders, marching out of the Territory, that the murder of Buford was committed by one of their number.

Of the hundred and more of Harvey's men originally taken, a number escaped. When the Court met at Leecompton, the eighty-eight that remained were indicted for murder. Harvey, though perfectly well known to have been their leader, was not only not indicted, but was appointed by Geary lieutenant in a company of militia which he raised for the local protection of Lawrence.

The first indictment tried was one against fifteen persons charged with having been Lane's party in the first attack on Hickory Point. The Jury returned a verdict of Not Guilty, but most of those thus acquitted were immediately rearrested on some new charge. Some time after twenty-one of Harvey's men were put on trial, all of whom were found guilty of manslaughter and sentenced to five years' imprisonment at hard labor. The remainder of the eighty-eight then obtained a change of venue, and were conveyed to Tecumseh to be tried there; but before the trial came, thirty-six of them succeeded in making their escape. Ten other prisoners also escaped from the Leecompton jail, as the Border Ruffians allege by the connivance of the United States soldiers, in whose custody they had been placed, and of whom the Leecompton Union speaks in the following terms:

"The majority of the United States army is composed of villainous Abolitionists; we mean the private soldiers, and such men are to be guarded Abolition cut-throats is a mystery we shall not attempt to solve."

It appears by the latest advices that sixteen more Free-State men have since been tried for murder and acquitted, and that nine others were then on trial.

Suppose these nine to be acquitted, which is probable, there will then remain in prison only twenty-one convicted of manslaughter and some six others not yet tried. The discharge of the whole of them would be quite a natural sequel to the removal of Leecompton.

KANSAS ITEMS.

From the Kansas Tribune, Dec. 6.

CAPITAL IN LAWRENCE.—Every house in Lawrence, public and private, is overrun with strangers who have recently entered the Territory. Most of them have come with the view of permanent settlement, and are searching for claims, and buying city property. A greater amount of capital is now represented in Lawrence, than has been at any former period. The future of Kansas was never so cheering as at present.

The Free State prisoners who were remaining at Tecumseh, had their trial before Judge Cato, last week, and were all discharged, to the number of fifteen. They had been in custody for nearly three months. Judge Cato's ruling did not smother so strongly of Border Ruffianism as did that of Judge Leecompton a few weeks previous.

Measures are being perfected for the organization of a City Government for Lawrence, by the people, independent of the bogus laws.

FEARFUL AND UNBELIEVING.—We received a letter yesterday, containing ten subscribers for the Herald of Freedom. The writer says, "none would give over six months as it is our private opinion, publicly expressed, that it is five months longer than it can live." We say, to the writer, he knows very little about the people of Kansas if he thinks they are so easily locked down. A Free Press is one in our city in the character of lecturer for many years. She commenced her address by an allusion to the different nations of the earth, their rise, progress, and decay; the birth, growth, power, and capacity and the death of men and Statesmen. She observed our country had suddenly become great, powerful and opulent, its press was free, thought uncensored, there were no stately palaces or courtly thrones to oppress industry, and the future appeared bright; yet she likened it to a beautiful woman who without was passing fat, while a cancer was eating into her heart, absorbing her strength, and infusing those who envied them. She spoke over an hour, and on concluding at the desire of the persons present, consented to deliver an after lecture on last evening—*Dulcinea, Republican.*

A post route agent has been spending several weeks between this place and St. Louis, laboring to learn the causes of the abuses, with a view of correcting the blunders or otherwise, in the transmission of the mails to and from Kansas. Whether he has been successful in his mission, we are not advised, but the abuses have been measurably corrected. The mails now arrive and depart regularly.

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

SALEM, OHIO, DECEMBER 20, 1856.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSMEN AND THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.

Twelve months ago the cry of the Republicans was, "No more Compromise with Slavery." The New York Tribune raised, and lesser lights, with speakers great and small echoed the cry, and made the welkin ring. That looked hopeful, at least it would have looked so, had we not known from past experience that politicians in a Union attempting to unite the monster antagonisms of Slavery and Freedom can no more nominate candidates, and conduct a canvass to its completion without compromise, than they can live without air to breathe. While this cry was upon their lips, they were busy weighing principle with expediency, and deciding how they could buy success in any direction by some concession to Slavery in another. Hence the late campaign has been marked by inconsistencies and compromises, so enormously inconsistent as to be almost incredible, especially when we consider that they were planned and executed by the men who have most reputation of all our politicians for moral firmness and courage. Who would have thought that Pilemon Bliss, and Edward Wade and Joshua R. Giddings would ever have voted "to enslave children born on free soil" in Kansas and to extend the Fugitive Slave Law over Kansas and Nebraska? How hard to believe it even now that the Congressional records force the unwilling conviction upon us, and their own attempted justification admits the charge. They had solemnly subscribed in the Pittsburgh Platform for Cassius M. Clay's truthful declaration that Congress has no more power to make a Slave than to make a King. And then in their seats in Congress they voted to put it on record for the

nation and posterity to read—That any children born of Slave mothers in either Kansas or Nebraska, up to January 1858 might be forever Slaves. Thus stultifying themselves by voting Slavery into Kansas and Nebraska for the present, in order to keep it out of Kansas in the future! Thus foolishly and wickedly do men traffic with moral principles, "deceiving and being deceived," when once they consent to be partners on equal terms with pirates and men-stealers in the conduct of a government, pretending to be for liberty.

But of Dunn's bill, and who voted for it, every body has heard. Republicans have heard of it, to their infinite vexation and to their cost too; for in Ohio, we have every reason to believe that at least one Republican Congressman lost his election for his vote given in favor of that bill, and that in spite of the cool justification of the act by the Republican papers. But though everybody has heard of Dunn's Bill, very few of the Republicans themselves or of their Democratic opponents know that the Republican Senators in Congress voted for the same thing, so far as the Fugitive Slave Law is concerned. They do not know that Hale and Seward and Wilson and Wade, voted expressly to extend the Fugitive Slave Law over Kansas. We expect that Republicans will deny this as they at first denied the vote of their Representatives on Dunn's Bill. But unhappily it is so, and we have the record. We gave the facts to our printers to put beside Dunn's Bill, before the election, but out of pity to the poor Compromising Republicans we had the weakness to withdraw it, and as nobody else printed it and it was not there, generally known, they escaped this difficulty, and the mortification of having it pressed upon their attention by would-be Congressman Woods, and other Democratic stumpers. But as we see no very marked evidence of reform in our Republican friends we shall keep their secret no longer, but tell the truth as it is, though it be to their shame and dishonor.

We learn from the record of proceedings in the Senate, July 2nd, 1856, that when a pro-slavery Territorial bill for Kansas was under consideration, Mr. Collamer of Vermont, the only Republican member of the Committee on Territories in the Senate, offered an amendment in the following words, as an additional section to the bill:

"And be it further enacted, That, until the people of said Territory shall form a Constitution and State government, and be admitted into the Union under the provisions of this act, there shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude in said Territory, otherwise than in punishment of crimes whereof the party shall be fully convicted; *Provided, always, That any person escaping into the same from whom labor or service is lawfully claimed in any State, such fugitive may be lawfully reclaimed and conveyed to the person claiming his or her service or labor as aforesaid.*"

The yeas and nays were ordered on this amendment; and being taken resulted:

YEAS, Messrs. Bell, of New Hampshire, Collamer, Fassett, Felt, Foster, Hale, Seward, Fremont, Wade, and Wilson—10.

NAYS, Messrs. Bayard, Bell, of Tennessee, Benjamin, Biggs, Bigler, Bright, Broadhead, Brown, Cass, Clay, Clayton, Crittenden, Dodge, Douglass, Evans, Fitzpatrick, Geyer, Hanger, Iverson, Johnson, Jones, of Iowa, Mallory, Mason, Pratt, Pugh, Reid, Sebastian, Sill, Stewart, Thompson, of Kentucky, Toombs, Toucy, Weller, Wright and Yates—35.

Thus it will be seen that a Republican from Vermont, moved to extend the Fugitive Slave Law over Kansas, while under territorial government, and all the Republican members of the Senate then present voted for it.

At the time of the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law in 1850, Senator Chase, contended that the Constitutional obligation of returning fugitive Slaves was not binding on the Territories, and moved an amendment limiting the application of the law to the States. Wm. L. Dayton, the late Republican candidate for Vice President, contended against Mr. Chase for the extension of the law in the Territories. Thus it stood apparently an open question till the 2nd of July 1856, when these ten Republican members of the Senate gave in their adhesion to Mr. Dayton's views and those of Slaveholders generally, thus by this voluntary vote throwing the weight of their moral and political influence on the side of Slave-hunting under the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850.

Who would have believed it—that Wade, who cursed the Fugitive Slave Law so lustily in 1851, and received the Senatorship in part for the hearty support of those very courses would have voted in 1856 to extend it over Kansas, as a compromise to secure freedom for that Territory! Who would have believed it of Wilson—who of Seward and Hale who so faithfully expounded its unconstitutional and its infernal injustice? What can we hope from a party whose purest and best men can do better than this. What can we expect for freedom under a government and a Union which compels the wisest, the noblest, the most unsullied politicians in the nation, to the degradation of such sort of compromising and bargaining with the practical ruffians who are marching right into the conquest of Kansas and the subjugation of the nation. So shut up were they by the result of national compromise, that this vote to extend the Fugitive Slave Law was the only offering that these popular Congressmen and venerable Senators could bring to the altar of Freedom. The G-dless spurs came an offering from her misguided votaries; and the Demon of Slavery exults over the humiliation which their necessity compels.

To such strains must inevitably be reduced all Compromisers of Liberty with Slavery. The Constitution compromised Liberty by surrendering the Fugitive Slave. Subsequent supporters of the Constitution compromised further by culminating iniquities of two Fugitive Slave Laws. Thus step by step the nation became more and more corrupted until "the party for freedom"—the party that is to regenerate the nation—commences its existence by silently ignoring the existence of such laws, and then in harmony with this guilty silence, its most distinguished friends in both Houses of Congress vote to extend this consummation of legalized slave-hunting villainy to the territory of Kansas, and all "honestly" for Freedom's sake in that same Territory! By such folly and madness is impressively illustrated the wisdom of the early rallying cry of Republicans—"No more Compromise with Slavery."—Aye, more; it demonstrates beyond contradiction, the wisdom of our motto—"NO UNION WITH SLAVE HOLDERS."

We invite the attention of our readers to the articles from Southern papers on our first page—to their tone, temper and characteristic policy.

WHITFIELD ADMITTED.—Whitfield, the Border Ruffian from Kansas, was admitted to his seat in the House of Representatives, by a majority of four.

WHY NOT ALTER THE CONSTITUTION?

Why not alter the Constitution? asks one and another who admit it to be pro-slavery and yet object to our proposition for a dissolution of the Union. Sure enough, why not? respond hosts of others who, ashamed of their position under the government, pro-slavery as it is, would "do something" to relieve themselves and help the Slave.

We once asked Senator Chase the same question, when he admitted the pro-slavery of the document. With something of impatience in his manner, provoked by the veranday which could ask such a question, he laconically replied, "Because it is impossible." And so it is. We don't seek for it because it is impracticable. Disunion is a much shorter remedy and more easily secured. Disunion is possible, because it can be brought about by the Northern States, or by any one of them. The Constitution cannot be altered without the Union of every Northern State, and the added cooperation of several of the Southern. Men who talk about the alteration of the Constitution so as to remove its pro-slavery, do not know what vote is required for that alteration. For their information, we copy from Art. V. of the Constitution, which prescribes the method of amendment. It is as follows:

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three-fourths thereof, as one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress."

Such are the only conditions on which the Constitution can be altered or amended. For example, would our friends attempt to relieve the North from the odium and guilt of Constitutional slave condition, the proposition must be made by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress or by the Legislatures of two-thirds of the States; that is of twenty-one States—the sixteen free and five of the slave States. This every one can see as an impossibility till these slave States are converted to abolitionism. But supposing the proposition made, the Convention called, and the alteration agreed to by a majority of the Convention, still it must be ratified by the vote of three-fourths of the States. That is, with the present number of States, twenty-three States must vote for the measure to secure its adoption, or in other words, all the non-slaveholding States and seven of the slave States. Just so, too, in regard to the clause concerning the foreign slave trade, (which is no longer to be considered a dead letter,) and the clauses concerning domestic insurrections and slave representation. It is manifest to all that before any such amendments can be made to the Constitution, the whole North and nearly one-half the slave States have got to be abolitionized. A long time to wait. Long ere it can be done, we can dissolve the Union, for to do that we have only to convert the North or to make a commencement in one of the States, as for example Ohio. Let her step forward and the work is done. Another important consideration is, that in this way we can do without doing evil to bring about the good—without swearing to support slavery through the Constitution in order to secure its overthrow. It is the practical, practicable, honest, manly course. Let us adopt it.

WHO ARE THE SLAVEHOLDERS.

Who are the actual present slaveholders, is becoming more and more manifest to all the people of this nation. The misapprehension that has so long deluded the unthinking, North and South, that the little handful of slave claimants are the slaveholders is becoming dissipated, and it is now one of the most obvious truths that this oligarchy is utterly powerless, except through its alliance with and control of non-slave claimants, north and south. Thus is made apparent the transparency of the pretence of Union saviors, whether found among the demagogues of the Republican or Democratic party.

As South Carolina bullying loses its power to terrify, honest northern souls, the familiarity of the people of the north to the idea of disunion, imports a real and serious danger to the friends of slavery; for the Union is the real or effective support of the system. This the oligarchs have always known and have sought to prevent northern assault upon it, by their brazen threats, that they would destroy it themselves—that they would tumble down with their own hands this Scavastip of their defence; and the silly, befuddled north have trembled at this childish threat of self-destruction. But the time for these threats to operate is fast passing away, and this branch of the trade of demagogues will we hope be day by day an end. That the political leaders whose trade is union saving, understand the true state of the question is made continually manifest by their own acts and declaration. The Union saving New York Tribune, has unhesitatingly proved that the southern slaveholding portion of the confederacy, hangs like an incubus upon the commercial and industrial prosperity of the north. That our union in aid of slave holding, subjects us to the increasing pillage of the practical slave States: That it has, through the church corrupted the morals of the north, and is fast bringing her manners down to the level of her own barbarian standard; and yet the Tribune and its friends claim to be the especial champions of the union which is making all this mighty evil to our physical and moral prosperity. All the prominent Republican papers make, in effect, this same exposure of the evils of our union, and are in consequence, by implication, charged by slaveholding Democrats with being disunionists. Such they are, just so far as they are anti-slavery. They only escape from the charge by the grossest moral and logical inconsistency, in denying this inevitable condition, and unblushingly declaring themselves the friends of the Union, beyond all other men.

The New York Evening Post, in an article written just before the election, gives its view of the influence of the Union in support of slavery, in the following emphatic language:

"It is not to be dissimulated that there are two sorts of men at the South who talk of disunion: the knaves who do it to frighten the North, and the madmen who do it to prepare the South for a separation from the free States."

"Both classes, however must see that these threats make no impression upon the North. It is one of the most remarkable circumstances of the present union for the Presidency, that the spirit of the people is so thoroughly roused that they pay no attention to big words. We laugh at the knaves, for we know their game, and we defy the madmen, for we know their utter impotence. Let the election be accomplished and the knaves them-

selves will help keep the madmen in order. They know that the safety of their plantations, the value of their negroes, and the profitable exchange of the products of their soil, all depend on their union with the free States; and if the men who are put forward to utter these threats make in a single step towards carrying them practically into effect, their masters will put forth that power which now so effectually imposes silence on all who entertain liberal opinions at the South and will crush them on the spot. The free States, they know, will never consent that the rivers which rise within their limits, and the bays and harbors through which these rivers pour themselves into the sea, shall pass, in any part of their course, under a foreign government. They know, too, that the robbery of our national exchequer and of our navy yards, which such prints as the Richmond Enquirer, and such speakers as Brooks and Butler, avow the determination to commit, would make the people of the free States start to their feet, and take down their guns from the wall. In a contest with the slave States, they know that they are weaker than the Roman empire, when, corrupted and enervated by the intestine evil of slavery, it fell helpless under the power of the invaders of the North—There is not a plantation in all the South the masters of which will not grow pale at the tidings of such a war—a war no longer the idle threat of a timid harangue, but lowering over them in its actual approach. It is their own soil that will be the seat of such a war; it is in their waters that the war steamers of the free states will carry their thunders and lightnings; it is their towns that will be exposed to capture. Of what they can do beyond their own limits we shall have no fear; their attention will be occupied at home with watching that class of their population whom they call their property. They cannot leave their ill-gadred homes to carry war into the populous region where every man is a freeman, and where every man on such an occasion would be a soldier. What terror would spread along the southern rivers, wherever the arms of the free states should penetrate—what desolation will fall on the plantations—how the workpeople would be dispersed! There is no owner of slaves at the South who does not feel the utter madness of provoking such a contest as that which Senator Butler speaks with such flippancy; who would not resort to every device of conciliation and postponement to avoid it, and who would not cheerfully purchase a continuance of the peace and prosperity they now enjoy under the shelter of the Union by the sacrifice of the whole class of politicians who stand forever on the verge of treason, and once in six weeks make a boisterous proclamation of their intention to pass beyond it."

In this forcible statement of the inherent weakness of slavery; and its dependence upon the Union for continued existence, every intelligent man in the nation must coincide, unless he be mad with political and slaveholding fanaticism. Especially must intelligent and prominent republicans, who have given the attention of clear minds and ardent feelings to the question, be convinced that the slave-claimants hold their slaves in security, only by the constitutional aid of the Union. We cannot think so meanly of their intellectual perceptions as to believe that they do not see these palpable facts. Indeed every anti-slavery speech they make proves that their eyes are open to them, and yet the exordium and peroration of every such speech is adorned with their most brilliant rhetoric in glorification of that Union. They curse slavery, and then pay their most devoted homage, and promise their utmost aid to prop up the main pillar of its support—"the Union as it has been, as is, and as they pray God it never may be." What then are such men but slave holders, convicted as such by their own anti-slavery professions. The saviors of the Union thereof, whether slave claimants in the South, or Democrats, Americans or Republicans in the North are the real and political slaveholders of the nation; as the New York Evening Post, in the quotations above has incontrovertibly shown. We therefore call upon all who are to any extent the enemies of slavery to cease their glorification of the Union, and join hands for the overthrow of this main pillar of an American despotism.

KENTUCKY.

Abolitionism is getting its roots firmly into the soil of Kentucky and were the friends of freedom there sustained as they should be by the countenance and thorough anti-slavery position of their neighbors in the non-slave holding states, it would grow and thrive with most encouraging rapidity. The labors and example of James G. Birney in 1833 are neither lost nor forgotten; the bold and manly course of Cassius M. Clay, and the fidelity and martyr firmness of John G. Fee, meet with responding sympathy from many other honest hearts who render also their cooperation and support to all practical measures of freedom. Notwithstanding the survivals under which all lovers of liberty are placed in the state, more than 400 votes were cast for Fremont at the late election. And with many who cast them, the vote meant more than was signified intentionally by many similar votes cast in Ohio. It meant more than a mere protest against the extension of slavery—it meant a protest against its existence in Kentucky. And even in Kentucky were a few clear sighted noble men who would not cast their vote for Fremont, because of the concessions by the party. They would not admit the rightful political existence of slavery in the states, and would not vote with a national party pledged by its candidates to let slavery alone in Kentucky. They believed that the way to abolish slavery, was to assault it. They were themselves vigorously engaged in that assault, and felt themselves entitled to the aid of the national government in their labors in its behalf. As republicans denied its ability to aid them, and affirmed its determination to live and rule in fraternal harmony with slavery in the states, they refused to give it the support of their votes even though it promised to exclude it from the territories.

The little company of men of whom we speak, believe that the general government may abolish slavery and with a boldness and consistency which evinces their honesty, they determined to carry their principles to the ballot box or stay away therefrom. If there be only two or three energetic men of this character in the state, they are a power there; a power that will be felt and make the despots tremble. That there are such men in Kentucky we learn from a communication of one of them, published in the *Ravenna Reformer*, previous to the election. From this it appears that John G. Fee, is one of these occupying this position; he does not expect to abolish slavery by concession, and will not compromise, and that he occupies a false position during the canvass in consequence of the unauthorized use of his name, by the Philadelphia Convention.

The writer may be mistaken or not, about the constitutional power of the government to abolish slavery, but they are abolitionists without conceal-

ment and without compromise. We honor them and the people of the north should sustain and defend them. No concessions should be made to slave holders.

The following is a part of the article from the *Reformer*, referred to above:

RADICAL ABOLITIONISMS OF KENTUCKY.

MEANS EDITORS:—Your readers will doubtless hear a few words from one on behalf of a few not ardent co-workers, with most of them, in the gigantic work of trying to save our falling nation. When it is remembered that the aims for which we are aspiring, rests not upon the election or defeat of either Fremont or Buchanan, but upon the overthrow and total extirpation of slavery throughout all the land, I say, when this is remembered by those who are laboring for that end, and when they see the number so small who will dare to venture all in such an undertaking, they feel rejected to hear of one here and another there, who are of like minds with themselves, and who are whetting their swords, not in view of slavery non-extension, but of the grand enthronement of universal liberty over all.

It is in behalf of a few such ones, that I address our brethren of the highly favored free States, who by their action at the ballot box in the coming election, design showing their sympathy for us of the South, as well as for the people of Kansas and the North.

There are times and circumstances during which if men do not speak, their manhood or position will not be truly known. So with us in Kentucky, having taken the Philadelphia Convention, and having taken no desired steps to form a permanent acting organization here at home; it has been and is generally supposed that there are no high or aims in Kentucky, than the Philadelphia Platform and Republican Anti-Slavery, and of course all will go for Mr. Fremont, who are prompted in the least toward Anti-Slavery. Not quite so friends. There are a few of us who are not ready by several steps, to Respond Amen when Mr. Fremont says, *I am in favor of opposing to interfering with Slavery where it exists under the administration of State Sovereignty.* We feel that most of us can give to every man who asks a reason for our position. We have had our fingers on the pulse of the great and vital question we have examined it in various fights, we have considered the merits of the Syracuse address of the nominating Convention, and then the Pittsburgh proceedings, the Philadelphia Platform, but our chief enquiry has been what can be done by the power of the constitution through Congress, or by the Supreme Court, to aid us in removing this monster iniquity. We have not been trying to find out what Congress cannot do, or what the general Government cannot do in the case. A point much in vogue through the North among the Republicans, and copied verbatim by the Republicans of Kentucky and Virginia.

Now of all men in this nation, who act at the ballot box, the anti-slavery men of the South should be the last to say that Congress should not secure justice in the Slave States, should not secure life liberty and happiness to the negro. They must suppose that the Constitution is not to secure these, or if so that Congress should not carry it out as far as the Slave States are concerned. It should be the paramount question with the anti-slavery men of the South, what powers of the general Government can be brought to bear on the question of destroying evil where it does exist (not where it does not exist.) But to return to my subject.

We are glad to present before us as standard bearer, that tried and noble man of God John G. Fee, who holds the principles of the Radical policy not because the policy who advocates the policy is a weak minority, but because he has the experience in being with majorities, and I suppose never hopes to have, unless he shall be so happy as to see the dawning of the millennium. It is not because he thinks it will be popular in the future to come, but because he has seen the glory demands it, that humanity demands it, that the requirement to love his neighbor as himself demands it, that a nation beginning to take the road to downfall as did ancient Rome and Greece demands it; he takes that position because it is right because it is the only position that is right for a foundation. He takes it because he desires to act the part not of the Priest and Levite, but of the Samaritan, to millions of poor, robbed, bruised and tortured fellow creatures.

Many doubtless suppose him to be acting with the Republican party, but this is not the case as appended to their list for the Philadelphia Convention, which was done without his previous knowledge or consent, and to which he is a disclaimer and sent it to Dr. Boley of the National Era, for publication, but it never came to light, a fact at which we are glad, for it is a man who can sit composedly in his sanctum and frame rhetoric, to justify lying slavery die off itself, seeming to forget that the great mass of slavery instead of chips and stones, contains flesh and blood, bones and sinews, and a mortal soul, every one of which must appear before the judgment seat of Christ—I say the man who can not quietly and advocate the scheme of letting such a heap of horrors die off itself, can very easily let facts die, that justice to those concerned would demand to be made public.

We may organize and nominate a State ticket perhaps not, just as the indications seem to direct. If we could have taken thirty steps in the beginning of the Summer, and could have had a good lecturer to have laid the claims of the Radical policy before the people, we could have polled a responsible vote for George South in this State. The truth is, that the Radical policy commends itself to the heart of every Southern Anti-Slavery man, and most at once when it is laid before them, see the consistency and become advocates of it.

But few have any light on the subject, and none previous to the publication of the Radical Abolitionist by Wm. Goodell. What the mass want is light. The mass of Anti-Slavery men in the South are Radical at heart, and yet the mass of them have never heard that such a party, as the Radical party, exists and has claims on their service for its support. And it doubtless seems strange to many of the Anti-Slavery men in the South who are going to support Fremont. Why all the powers of general Government are pledged to protect the man and his family who go to Kansas from the blight of Slavery, Fremont is elected, and yet he of the South's duly warned that so far as the powers of the general Government are concerned, he will be left to take care of himself as best he can.

But we are told we must abolish Slavery here by our State laws. That we must confess is a very beautiful theory, but for details look rather Herulean when we remember who are to begin and carry it through. So if Buchanan is elected, poor Kansas according to the Republican policy, will have to bear us company and have to rid herself of Slavery by her State laws. We are told for our encouragement that if the shield of the general Government is removed from Slavery it will die of itself. Doubtless some of the Roman Emperors when they saw Rome tottering to her fall, hoped that the blight of Slavery, hoped that it would die of itself. Perhaps George Washington, learned seaman of Greece, when they saw Greece tottering to her overthrow from the same cause, hoped that Slavery would die of itself. Do the mass of this nation wish to see such an end to slavery. If indeed they see that event and witness the loss of the last fair chance of the living body chained to the dead one, when the living cries out who shall deliver me from this body of death—so the falling power of a once fair prospect for a glorious nation will cry out, who shall deliver us from this body of death. We feel to say that Slavery has no right to die, to right but to be killed, and the people of this nation are recreant to the duty they owe to God's justice, liberty and humanity, so long as they refuse to do it. It is the nations duty to abolish Slavery and uproot humanly, to drag down tyrants and enthroned universal liberty over all. For this end we expect to labor until attained, or the nation be in ruins a sacrifice to its own evil work.

Yours for a thorough work,

J. G. II.
Germantown Ky. Oct. 21, 1856.